

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,327,929 to Yanagisawa (hereinafter Yanagisawa). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because for at least the following reasons, Yanagisawa fails to disclose all of the elements as set forth and arranged in the claims.

First, Applicants' arguments as filed in the Amendment of May 24, 2005 are still pertinent and, therefore, are incorporated herein by reference.

Second, for at least the following two reasons, the Examiner's interpretation of Yanagisawa is mistaken.

(i) In Yanagisawa, the elements cited by the Examiner as being a base (16, 18) are movable, whereas in the presently claimed invention the base is not movable but is fixed.

(ii) Yanagisawa fails to disclose a base having both a drive element and guide elements as set forth in claim 1. The Examiner cites each of Yanagisawa's elements 42, 16, 18, and 10, as being a possible base as set forth in claim 1. See the Office action at page 2, item 2, paragraph 2, lines 1-2. Each one of these elements is not a base as set forth in claim 1.

With respect to Yanagisawa's element 42, it fails to have a drive element provided at one of two non-adjacent ends of the base on which there is also provided a guide element. Instead, each of the drive elements 24 and 22 are provided down the center thereof. Further, drive element 24 is equidistant from guide elements 17, whereas guide element 22 is equidistant from guide elements 19. Accordingly, there is no drive element on the same end of the base on which there is also a guide element. In this situation, the Examiner also fails to set forth which element she then considers the slider as claimed.

With respect to Yanagisawa's element 16, it fails to have a drive element provided at one of two non-adjacent ends of the base on which there is also provided a guide element. Instead, drive element 24 is provided down the center thereof, equidistant from each of the guide

elements 17. A similar arrangement is found with element 18. With respect to element 18, for example, if the Examiner attempts to cite the right and left (as directions are shown in Yanagisawa's Fig. 1) as non-adjacent ends of the base, then such an interpretation will fail to meet at least dependent claim 9, wherein the guides are set forth as being parallel to the non-adjacent ends of the base on which they are disposed.

If the Examiner attempts to call Yanagisawa's element 10 a base, then one of the X-axis stage and Y-axis stage are left to be the slider as claimed. However, each of the sliders 16 and 18 will have the same stiffness in the yaw direction thereof no matter in what position they are disposed on the base 10. That is, for example, the guide elements 19 on the Y-axis stage 18 do not engage directly with the X-axis stage 16; instead, they are engaged with element 42 so that both the X-axis and Y-axis stages are connected to the element 42. Accordingly, no matter in what position the X-axis and Y-axis stages are disposed, the arrangement will look like that in Fig. 5A of the present application, wherein the slider is supported by guide elements of the same configuration, and a drive element is disposed adjacent to one of the guide elements.

For at least any of the above reasons, Yanagisawa fails to anticipate Applicants' claims 1-11.

### **Request for Personal Interview**

Applicants respectfully request that before the Examiner issues an Advisory Action, that she contact the undersigned at the number listed below to set up a time where Yanagisawa can be discussed in person. Although this application is after Final Office Action, due to the nature of the subject matter, it is believed that a beneficial, prosecution-furthering, discussion can be made with both the Examiner and undersigned looking and pointing to the same figures of the reference.


### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jeffrey A. Schmidt  
Registration No. 41,574

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 28, 2005